

**REMARKS**

Applicant submits herewith a set of formal drawings corresponding to the originally filed drawings, which the Examiner has objected to. No new matter is entered.

The claims are rejected in view of U.S. patent 6,260,050 (YOST) and a publication by Panos Vassiliadis (VASSILIADIS). The independent claims are amended to more fully distinguish over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite "metadata objects". As stated on page 11, lines 7-9, "The user interface of client 202 provides a user with the ability to build a report by graphically dragging and dropping reporting objects (e.g., Section, Table, Crosstab) and metadata objects (e.g., Dimensions, Hierarchies, Levels, Members) onto a report."

Claim 1 recites that a user accepts input to select at least one reporting object and one metadata object. The Examiner only points to an arguable reference to a reporting object.

Claim 1 further recites the parsing of a selected reporting object into layout information and a selected metadata object into data definition information. The Examiner acknowledges that YOST fails to teach this limitation. Instead, the Examiner maintains that VASSILIADIS teaches "a drilldown operation through the dimensions of the report and while drilling down, queries will be sent to retrieve rows, which is similar to the claimed limitation." Applicant cannot identify any nexus between the recited drill down operation and the parsing of a selected reporting object into layout information and the parsing of a selected metadata object into data definition information. Reconsideration of the Examiner's position is respectfully requested. If the Examiner persists in this position, an explanation for the position is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is further limited to using the data definition information to deduce a set of data and then create one or more queries based upon the deduced set of data. Observe here that queries are created from deduced data. Queries are typically used to deduce data, not vice versa, as claimed. The prior art of record does not show or suggest the claimed creation of queries from deduced data in combination with the other limitations of claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites that retrieved data is secured based upon the application of one of the queries to a data source. A report is then presented based upon the retrieved data and the layout

information (as specified by the metadata object). The prior art also fails to show or suggest these claim operations.

In sum, claim 1 includes a number of limitations that are not shown or suggested by the prior art of record. Thus, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 and 8-10 should be in a condition for allowance. New claim 16 is an apparatus claim with limitations of the type discussed in connection with claim 1. Therefore, claim 16 and its dependent claims 17-19 should also be in a condition for allowance.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. If there are any other residual formalities that need to be resolved prior to allowing the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees to Deposit Account No. 03-3117.

Dated: **March 29, 2006**

COOLEY GODWARD LLP  
ATTN: Patent Group  
Five Palo Alto Square  
3000 El Camino Real  
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155  
Tel: (650) 843-5000  
Fax: (650) 857-0663

Respectfully submitted,  
**COOLEY GODWARD LLP**



By: \_\_\_\_\_

William S. Galliani  
Reg. No. 33,885